

PR4



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,859	06/01/2001	Coyle Brett Marl	05146.00006	1098

7590 10/05/2004

Thomas L. Evans  
Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.  
11th Floor  
1001 G. Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TRONG NHAN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/872,859

Applicant(s)

MARL ET AL.

Examiner

Jack P Nguyen

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 June 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) •
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-35 are being examined.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claims 1-3, 12, 27, 29, 30, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hong, WO 00/225443 (Hong hereafter).**

As per claim 1, Hong teaches a method of determining information for accessing an electronic mail account according to an electronic mail protocol, comprising receiving an address for delivering electronic mail to an electronic mail account; receiving a password for accessing the electronic mail account; extracting (parsing), from the address, a user name (user identifier or userid) and an electronic mail account domain for the electronic mail account; and determining whether the electronic mail account domain, user name and password can be used to access the electronic mail account according to the electronic mail protocol (abstract; page 2, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph).

As per claim 27, it is rejected on same rationale as claim 1. Hong further teaches an address decomposer (1, fig. 1) for decomposing an address for accessing an electronic mail account into a user name for the electronic mail account and a domain for the electronic mail account; a server mapper (2, fig. 1; access database stores the accessed domains for future reference [page 10, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph]) for comparing the domain with a list of domains stored in a database; and a real time query unit (1, fig. 1) for attempting to access the electronic mail account according to the electronic mail account using the user name and the domain extracted from the address (page 8, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> paragraphs).

As per claim 2, Hong teaches determining whether the electronic mail account domain, user name and password can be used to access the electronic mail account according to the electronic mail protocol includes determining if the electronic mail account domain is included in a list of closed domains that do not include server computers employing the electronic mail protocol (page 2, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph; access database stores the accessed domains for future reference [page 10, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph]).

As per claim 3, Hong teaches if the electronic mail account domain is not included in the list of closed domains, further including: accessing a list of known domains, such that at least one server computer known to employ the electronic mail protocol is associated with each of the known domains; mapping the electronic mail

Art Unit: 2152

account domain against the list of known domains; and if the electronic mail account domain is included in the list of known domains, attempting to access the electronic mail account at one or more of the server computers associated with the electronic mail account domain using the user name and address (page 2, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph; page 9, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph).

Claims 12, 29, 30 and 35 are rejected for same rationale as claim 3 addressed above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 4-11, 13-26, 28, 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong in view of "Official Notice".**

As per claim 4, Hong teaches the user enters in his email address and password to log on to the system (page 10, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph). Hong does not teach prompting the user to re-enter in user name and password for failed user name and/or password.

Art Unit: 2152

However, it is well known and expected in the art when the electronic mail account cannot be accessed through the computer server because of an incorrect username or password, the system then prompts a user to resubmit the user name (email address) and password for the electronic mail account, and attempting to access (log on) the electronic mail account by using the resubmitted user name and password. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include a mechanism that would allow the user to re-enter their user name and password in case of a typo or incorrect entry of data.

Claims 5, 13 and 14 are rejected on same basis as claim 4 addressed above.

As per claims 6 and 7, Hong teaches parsing the email address to extract the domain name from the email address (page 2, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph). Hong teaches if the extracted domain name does not match with the domain name stored in the system (Table T2, fig. 2), the mail client application (MCA) sends out a DNS inquiry to check for the Mail Exchange (MX) record to obtain a list of domain names from DNS database that support a plurality of email protocols such as POP3, IMAP4, etc (page 2, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph). The MCA then uses the userid (email address) and password previously entered by the client [S1, fig. 3A; page 10, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph] to match with data from an email account from one of the domain servers obtained from the inquiry above. If the response is positive, then emails from the user's server can be retrieved by the MCA for access by the user and the user's server and domain are saved as defaults in the access database (Tables T1, T2, fig. 2) for future reference in order to gain faster email

Art Unit: 2152

access. The claimed method is an obvious variation of Hong teachings since Hong teaches the system upon obtaining a list of all the domain name variations of the server, the system checks each one to determine if they work (page 9, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph; page 10, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph.) Hong does not specifically teach adding mail, pop, pop3 to the domain name. "Official Notice" is taken that it is well known and common in the art to use mail, pop, pop3, etc., as prefix for a mail server domain name. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the prefix mail, pop, pop3, because it would enable a quick with high probability search for determining whether a mail server exists at the domain name.

Claims 8-11, 15-24 are rejected on same rationale as claims 4 and 6 addressed above.

Claims 25, 26 and 32 are rejected for same rationale as claim 6 addressed above.

As per claims 28 and 33, Hong teaches saving the accessed domains in the access database for future reference (page 3, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph). Hong does not specifically teach saving a list of closed domains. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to be motivated to also store a list of closed domains that do not include server computers employing the electronic mail protocol so the system does not have to go through the process of verifying all the closed domains in the future to save time and increase efficiency by allowing the user faster access to the emails as disclosed on [page 10, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph].

As per claim 31, it is well known in the art for the system (or system administrator) to concatenate (modify) a server name prefix (pre-configured prefix) with another name (from email domain) to form a default name for a server computer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify and/or customize the pre-configured server names according to the naming convention of the company for easy recognition and to be in compliance with the company's naming standards.

Claim 34 is rejected on the same rationale as claim 3 addressed above.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Goldman et al, 5,684,951 ; Holleran et al, 5,752,059 ; Kawamata, 6,334,140 ; McDowell et al, 6,438,583 ; Berdinelli et al, 6,631,416 ; L'Heureux et al, 6,697,942 ; Lee et al, 6,108,691

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jack P Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 605-4299. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00 PM.



Art Unit: 2152

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). jpn



Dung C. Dinh  
Primary Examiner